

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WENONAH PARKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

KILOLO KIJAKAZI, acting  
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

CASE NUMBER: 1:20-cv-00601-GSA

**ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION**

Plaintiff moves for an unopposed 15-day extension of time from September 23, 2021 to October 8, 2021 to file a reply brief due to counsel's increased work responsibilities. This is Plaintiff's third extension in this case and the first extension of this specific deadline.

The Scheduling Order allows for a single extension of thirty days by the stipulation of the parties. Doc. 6 at 3. Beyond the single extension by stipulation, "requests to modify [the scheduling] order must be made by written motion and will be granted only for good cause." *Id.*

When considering whether good cause exists to modify a scheduling order, courts consider the foreseeability of the impediment to meeting the deadline and the party's diligence in seeking the extension once it became apparent they could not meet the deadline. *See Sharp v. Covenant Care LLC*, 288 F.R.D. 465, 467 (S.D. Cal. 2012); *Ordaz Gonzalez v. Cty. of Fresno*, No. 1:18-CV-01558-BAM, 2020 WL 2539287, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. May 19, 2020). The Court has the inherent power to manage its own docket to achieve an orderly and expeditious resolution of cases. *Southern California Edison Co. v. Lynch*, 307 F.3d 794 (9th Cir. 2002).

Given counsel's increased workload, the voluminous administrative record (approximately 2000 pages), and that counsel sought the extension well in advance of the deadline, good cause

exists for the extension.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's deadline to file a reply brief is extended to and including October 8, 2021.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 14, 2021

/s/ Gary S. Austin  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE